

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the instant application in view of the above amendments and following remarks, which place the application into condition for allowance.

#### **I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS**

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Claims 1-14 are allowed, claims 15-18 and 21 are rejected, and claims 19 and 20 are objected to in the Office Action mailed May 5, 2006. By this Amendment, claims 15, 17 and 20 are amended and claim 19 is canceled without prejudice to its subsequent prosecution in any continuing application or disclaimer of the proprietary rights set forth therein. No new subject matter is added as a result of the claim amendments.

Initially, the Examiner is thanked for allowing claims 1-14 and for indicating that claims 19 and 20 contain allowable subject matter.

#### **II. THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

In numbered paragraph 2 of the Office Action, claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. The Examiner states that the meaning and scope of the phrase "on an axially outside of the storage means" is unclear and grammatically incorrect. In response, as detailed above, claim 17 has been amended to recite "on an axially outer surface of the wall portion." This language is similar to the language used in claim 18. In view of the above claim amendment, it is respectfully requested that the § 112 rejections be withdrawn.

### **III. THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claims 15, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,334,587 to Röder ("Röder "). In addition, in paragraph 6 of the Office Action, claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Röder. Lastly, in paragraph 7 of the Office Action, claim 17 is rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Röder in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,366,085 to Kewin ("Kewin"). The rejections are traversed for at least the following reasons.

In paragraph 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claim 19 contains allowable subject matter. Therefore, as outlined above, independent claim 15 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 19. Specifically, claim 15 now recites, *inter alia*, that "the storage means mounting member is provided with an abutment portion abutting against an end face of the core tube."

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that revised independent claim 15 patentably distinguishes over Röder and Kewin, either alone or in combination because the relied upon portions of the cited references fail to teach each and every limitation of revised claim 15. Therefore, claim 15 is allowable. Further, claims 16-21, which depend from claim 1, are allowable therewith.

Statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited references represent the present opinions of the Applicants' undersigned attorney and, in the event that the Examiner disagrees with any such opinions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the respective reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is believe that all of the claims in this application are patentable over the prior art, and an early and favorable consideration thereof is solicited.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By: Anthony D. Mustillo  
Anthony D. Mustillo  
Reg. No. 58,836  
(212) 588-0800